

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TAZMA DIWALI ANAYA,
Plaintiff,

v.

MARIN COUNTY SHERIFF,
Defendant.

Case No. [13-cv-04090-WHO](#)

**ORDER ON REQUEST FOR AN
EXTENSION OF TIME**

Re: Dkt. No. 89


Plaintiff has filed a request for an extension of time to respond to defendant's motion to dismiss her Third Amended Complaint. Docket No. 89. This is plaintiff's twelfth request for an extension of time to respond to a defense motion in this case. The reasons plaintiff states in support of her current request are essentially the same as in her prior requests: plaintiff has a hard time meeting deadlines given her multiple sclerosis symptoms and the stress of responding to this case and pending criminal charges in San Francisco further exacerbate her MS symptoms. Docket No. 89.

I am sympathetic to plaintiff's condition. As a result, I have been extremely lenient with plaintiff and have granted almost every request for additional time. But my leniency has not resulted in any progress in this case and the delay is beginning to burden defendants. Plaintiff filed this case and needs – to the best of her ability – to move it forward by responding to defendant's motions. I will grant plaintiff one last extension of time. Plaintiff's opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss is due by **Wednesday March 4, 2015**. Defendant's reply is due by March 11, 2015. The hearing on the motion to dismiss is reset to **Wednesday March 25, 2015** at 2:00 p.m. in Courtroom 2 on the 17th Floor of the courthouse. No further extensions of time will be granted.

1 If plaintiff fails to file her opposition by March 4, 2015, I may dismiss this case for failure
2 to prosecute under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4 Dated: February 17, 2015

5 
6 WILLIAM H. ORRICK
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California